

(c) what are the amounts for which the toll has been auctioned since its inception?

Rao Sahib Mr. T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar.—(a) From 15th Makaram 1103.

(b) Some people of the locality represented to the Diwan Peishkar on 28th Mithunam 1103 (the date of sale of the tolls in the Cochin-Kanayannur Taluk for 1104) the hardship caused to them. The Tahsildar was accordingly asked to enquire into the matter. Pending the disposal of the complaint the auction of the toll in question was not conducted on that day.

(c) At first for Rs. 250. But the bidder failed to deposit the security. The toll was accordingly reaucted. The amount fetched at the resale was Rs. 155.

Construction of a Church at Perambra Village.

158. Mr. C. J. Mathew.—Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) whether the Government received a petition from Pullen Vareed Ousephunni and others of the Perambra village, Mukundapuram Taluk, praying the Government for sanction to construct a Church and cemetery in Survey No. 154 of the Perambra Village on 29th February 1928, and if so, will the Government be pleased to place a copy of it on the Table;

(b) whether any action has been taken upon this petition; and if so, what it is;

(c) whether the Diwan Peishkar and the Mukundapuram Tahsildar have submitted reports on this matter before and after the Government received the petition referred to in (a), and if so, will the Government be pleased to lay them on the Table?

Rao Sahib Mr. T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar.—(a) Yes. A copy of the petition is placed on the Table. (*Vide Appendix III.*)

(a) The matter is under enquiry.

(c) Yes. Government consider that it is not in public interests to place such reports on the Table at this stage.

Mr. C. J. Mathew.—Is there not a rule, Sir, that, within 90 days from the date of applying for the erection of a religious institution for public worship, orders should be passed and that, in the absence of any orders within 90 days, they might erect the place of worship?

Rao Sahib Mr. T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar.—Yes.

Mr. C. J. Mathew.—This is dated 29th February 1928. Nearly 4 or 5 months have elapsed.

Rao Sahib Mr. T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar.—I think

it is a petition for re-consideration. Sanction was refused once for that, so that the 90 days' rule would not apply. It is not a new application. It is for the re-consideration of the orders passed by Government.

Mr. C. J. Mathew.—It is a reminder.

Rao Sahib Mr. T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar.—That is to say, it is a petition for review. They applied for sanction which was refused by Government. Certain questions were to be settled. They wanted the benefit of review by asking Government to re-consider the orders once passed.

Mr. C. J. Mathew.—So, that does not amount to a new petition?

Rao Sahib Mr. T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar.—It is not a new application.

Mr. C. J. Mathew.—The answer to sub-division(c) is 'yes'. It is said that the Diwan Peishkar and the Tahsildar have submitted their reports already. Then where is the delay? When was the report submitted?

Rao Sahib Mr. T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar.—Just before I went on leave in Meenam.

Mr. C. J. Mathew.—Therefore, it is more than six months since the report was submitted.

Mr. A. K. Vengu Ayyar.—It is pending orders of the Government. We have asked the Chief Medical and Sanitary Officer to make inquiries regarding the sanitary condition of the place which may or may not be affected by the opening of a cemetery there. They want to construct the church in a thickly peopled locality. His report has been just received.

Mr. C. J. Mathew.—Is that cemetery objected to by the Diwan Peishkar? Has he made a reference to that? Was the Medical Officer asked to inquire and report whether the sanitary condition of the place would be affected by the opening of a cemetery?

Mr. A. K. Vengu Ayyar.—The Chief Medical Officer was asked to inquire and report, and he has reported.

Mr. C. J. Mathew.—Have you received the report?

Mr. A. K. Vengu Ayyar.—Yes.

Mr. C. J. Mathew.—When was that received?

Mr. A. K. Vengu Ayyar.—I do not remember the exact date. That was received very recently during the sitting of the Council.

Mr. C. J. Mathew.—But this matter has been pending for six months.

Mr. A. K. Vengu Ayyar.—I realise it. The report was received during the sitting of this Council, if I remember correctly.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
APPENDIX III.

855

(*Vide Answer to Question No. 158*).

Petition dated 29th February 1928 from Pullan Vareed Ousepunni of Perambra Village, Mukundapuram Taluk and others of the same village.

We, Pullan Vareed Ousepunni of Perambra Village, Mukundapuram Taluk, and others of the same and adjoining villages, beg to submit the following for your kind consideration:—

We had petitioned the Government for sanction to put up a church and a cemetery in Survey No. 154 of the Perambra Village. We are very much grieved to see that by order dated 15th February 1928, Dis. No. 1653/D/1103 the Government have rejected our prayer. The order is as follows:—

"As a result of the enquiries made, it is found that the site selected for the church and cemetery is not free from objections. The Para procession of the Poonilarkavu temple and the Thandika procession connected with Puthiri and Mukkidi in the Koodelmanikkam temple pass through the road adjoining the site and the erection of the church and cemetery at the site will affect these ceremonies, especially those of the Koodalmanikkam temple. The Hindu inhabitants of Potta desam may also resent the act as they dedicate their Para offerings to the deity on the road just in front of the Survey No. selected for the church and cemetery. It is further reported there is a private water pandal on the other side of the road opposite to Survey No. 154 and its usefulness may be affected by the location of the church and cemetery in Survey No. 154. In these circumstances, the permission applied for cannot be granted".

Without exposing ourselves to the charge of belittling the importance of the ceremonies and processions referred to in the order above quoted we may state that the presence of a church and cemetery in the Survey No. in question would not in any way affect them. The Thandika procession is the carrying on bamboo poles of some bunches of bananas from the Koodalmanikkam Devaswam Madham at Potta, for use in the Puthiri and Mukkudi ceremonies at the temple at Irinjalakkuda. The distance the Thandika has to travel is nearly 8 miles and it does not stand to reason to say that all through these 8 miles no place of public worship can be permitted to be constructed. The Thandika procession passes in front of the Ezhuva temple at Irinjalakkuda and also through the exclusively Christian street at the place. It may be remembered that the Ezhuva temple was put up only recently. As regards the Para procession it starts from Poonilarkavu in Kodakara and proceeds southwards till Muringur. You are well aware what a Para procession is. The "Para" in question passes just in front of the Perambra and Chalakkudi Churches. The Chalakkudi Church, it may be remembered, abuts on the public road. We do not know whether the Hindu inhabitants of Potta desam have actually resented the location of a church. The order says that they may also resent. The offerings are made in the public road a furlong off to the south from the site selected by us. We beg to submit that absolutely no objection exists on the foregoing grounds.

Another ground taken is that there is a private water-pandal on the other side of the road and that its usefulness may be affected by the location of the church and cemetery in Survey No. 154. We refrain from making any comments on this last ground and leave it to your mature judgment to see how far that ground can be urged against the establishment of a place of public worship for over 200 families of Catholic Christians who at present have to travel large distances to attend the church services. You are aware that it is very hard that they should be disabled from discharging their religious duties owing to the absence of a place of public worship near by.

An inspection of the place in question, we are sure, will convince you that the site selected by us is quite unobjectionable.

For these reasons we pray that you may be pleased to pass orders giving us permission to put up a church and cemetery in the aforesaid Survey No. 154.